



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/798,580

03/10/2004

Arnold Blinn

MS#304543.01 (5101)

6335

38779 7590 11/10/2008
SENNIGER POWERS LLP (MSFT)
100 NORTH BROADWAY
17TH FLOOR
ST. LOUIS, MO 63102

EXAMINER

SHAIFER HARRIMAN, DANT B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2434

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/10/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/798,580	Applicant(s) BLINN ET AL.	
	Examiner DANT B. SHAFER HARRIMAN	Art Unit 2434	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 10 & 12, 13, 15, 19, 20, 22, 23, 30, 32 - 38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 10, 12, 13, 15, 19, 20, 22, 23, 30, 32 - 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03/10/2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/25/2008 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

Status of the instant application:

- Claims 1, 15, 22, 30, 35 are amended in the instant application.
- Claims 2 – 10, 13, 19, 20, 23, 33, 36, 37, 38 are original in the instant application.
- Claim 12, 34 are previously presented in the instant application.
- Claims 11, 14, 16 – 18, 21, 24 – 29, 31, 39, 40 are cancelled in the instant application.
- Claims 1 – 10 & 12, 13 & 15 & 19, 20 & 22, 23 & 30 & 32 – 38 are pending in the instant application.

Response to Arguments

- Applicants arguments/remarks and amendments filed 09/25/2008 have been fully considered, but are moot in grounds of new rejection. Please see the office action below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2434

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim(s) 1 – 10 & 12, 13, 15, 19, 20, 22, 23, 30, 32 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkataramappa (US 2003/0188193 A 1) in view of Zhang et al. (US 7036142 B1) further in view of Lutz (US Patent No. 2003/0204579 A1).

Both Venkataramappa and Zhang are references cited in the applicant's information Disclosure Statement.

Venkataramappa discloses a client that requests services from a first network server and a second network server and any subsequent network server in the network, Paragraph: 0054 & 0059 & 0060 & 0061. The client is authenticated by a first network server, the first network server sends a request to the KDC (i.e. central server) server, Paragraph: 0055. The KDC is made up of a Kerberos authentication server and a TGS (ticket granting service), Paragraph: 0053. The KDC allows the user or client to sign on only once, without having to sign on multiple times, the TGT and SSO token allows the second server or other servers to recognize which client or user has been authenticated before, Paragraph: 0057 & 0058 & 0059, and will not request that the user sign on again when requesting service or content from other or different servers on the network, Paragraphs: 0054 & 0067.

Venkataramappa does not appear to explicitly disclose first and second servers are in different domains or storing first data on the

Art Unit: 2434

client in response to the received first request, said first data identifying the first service wherein the authentication of the user by the first service is optional, also Venkataramappa doesn't disclose allowing the user to access the first service without authenticating the user.

However, Zhang discloses single sign on users or subscribers to access both public and private domains (i.e. different domains and different domain content servers) when requesting content or service for the network server, Col 5, lines 30 - 51.

Further, However Lutz discloses, storing first data (i.e. the service providers HTTP response analyzer selection page) on the client in response to the received first request, said first data identifying the first service wherein the authentication of the user by the first service is optional (Paragraph: 0041); also Lutz, also discloses allowing the user to access the first service without authenticating the user(Paragraph: 0041).

Venkataramappa and Zhang and Lutz are analogous art because they are from the "same field of endeavor," allow a user to be authenticated and access multiple content servers.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Venkataramappa and Zhang before him or her, to modify a client that requests services from a first network server and a second network server and any subsequent network server in the network, Paragraph: 0054 & 0059 & 0060 & 0061. The client is authenticated by a first

Art Unit: 2434

network server, the first network server sends a request to the KDC (i.e. central server) server, Paragraph: 0055. The KDC is made up of a authentication server and a TGS (ticket granting service), Paragraph: 0053. The KDC allows the user or client to sign on only once, without having to sign on multiple times, the TGT and SSO token allows the server or servers to recognize which client or user has been authenticated before, Paragraph: 0057 & 0058 & 0059 and will not request that the user sign on again, Paragraph 0054 & 0067 of Venkataramappa to include the authentication to access multiple domains, Col 5, lines 30 - 51 of Zhang, further to include the optional user authentication by the first server of Lutz, paragraph: 0041.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to sign on once and allowed access to multiple servers in multiple domains without having to re - authenticate again, Paragraph: 0074 of Lutz , please also see **KSR v. Teleflex**, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007)) .

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Venkataramappa with Zhang, further combine Lutz to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim(s).

Claim(s) 35 - 38 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being obvious over Venkataramappa (US 2003/0188193 A 1) in view of Stanko (US PG PUB# 20050074126) further in view of Lutz (US Patent No. 2003/0204579 A1).

Both Venkataramappa and Stanko are references cited in the applicant's information Disclosure Statement.

Art Unit: 2434

Venkataramappa discloses a client that requests services from a first network server and a second network server and any subsequent network server in the network, Paragraph: 0054 & 0059 & 0060 & 0061. The client is authenticated by a first network server, the first network server sends a request to the KDC (i.e. central server) server, Paragraph: 0055. The KDC is made up of a Kerberos authentication server and a TGS (ticket granting service), Paragraph: 0053. The KDC allows the user or client to sign on only once, without having to sign on multiple times, the TGT and SSO token allows the second server or other servers to recognize which client or user has been authenticated before, Paragraph: 0057 & 0058 & 0059, and will not request that the user sign on again when requesting service or content from other or different servers on the network, Paragraphs: 0054 & 0067.

Venkataramappa does not appear to explicitly disclose a computer readable medium that executes a client that requests services from a first network server and a second network server and any subsequent network server in the network, the client is authenticated by a first network server, the first network server sends a request to the KDC (i.e. central server) server which is made up of a Kerberos authentication server and a TGS (ticket granting service), the KDC allows the user or client to sign on only once, without having to sign on multiple times, the TGT and SSO token allows the server or servers to recognize which client or user has been authenticated before, and will not request that the user sign on again, further Venkataramappa doesn't disclose a response component for storing first data on the client in response to the received first request, said first data identifying the first service wherein the authentication of the user by the first service is optional.

However, Stanko discloses a computer readable medium that allows a user through a client machine to be authenticated by an

Art Unit: 2434

authentication server for access to a secure server that will provide content to the client or users request, Paragraph: 0042 & 0078. The user will only have to be authenticated once by the authentication server, to be allowed access to other secured servers on the network, Paragraph: 0050. This is possible by the fact that a authentication ticket is stored on both a the client and the authentication server to which other secured servers have access to on the network, Paragraph: 0048 & 0049 & 0050.

Further, However Lutz discloses, storing first data (i.e. the service providers HTTP response analyzer selection page) on the client in response to the received first request, said first data identifying the first service wherein the authentication of the user by the first service is optional (Paragraph: 0041); also Lutz, also discloses allowing the user to access the first service without authenticating the user (Paragraph: 0041).

Venkataramappa and Stanko and Lutz are analogous art because they are from the "same field of endeavor," which is the field of authenticating a user or client once, with a proof of the authentication stored on the client and the content server and the authentication authority, which will allow the user or client subsequent access to plurality of other content servers on the network without having to be re-authenticated again.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Venkataramappa and Stanko before him or her, to modify a client that requests services from a first network server and a second network server and any subsequent network server in the network, Paragraph: 0054 & 0059 & 0060 & 0061. The client is authenticated by a first

Art Unit: 2434

network server, the first network server sends a request to the KDC (i.e. central server) server, Paragraph: 0055. The KDC is made up of a Kerberos authentication server and a TGS (ticket granting service), Paragraph: 0053. The KDC allows the user or client to sign on only once, without having to sign on multiple times, the TGT and SSO token allows the second server or other servers to recognize which client or user has been authenticated before, Paragraph: 0057 & 0058 & 0059, and will not request that the user sign on again when requesting service or content from other or different servers on the network, Paragraphs: 0054 & 0067 of Venkataramappa to include a computer readable medium that allows a user through a client machine to be authenticated by an authentication server for access to a secure server that will provide content to the client or users request, Paragraph: 0042 & 0078. The user will only have to be authenticated once by the authentication server, to be allowed access to other secured servers on the network, Paragraph: 0050. This is possible by the fact that a authentication ticket is stored on both a the client and the authentication server, Paragraph: 0048 & 0049 & 0050 of Stanko, further to include the optional user authentication by the first server of Lutz, paragraph: 0041.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been allowing a user or client to access a vast array of information or content from a variety of sources in a network without having to authenticate numerous times when the user wants to request another service from a different content or service provider on the network, Paragraphs: 0074 of Lutz, also please see **KSR v. Teleflex**, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007))

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Stanko with Venkataramappa and further combined with Lutz to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim(s).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANT B. SHAFER HARRIMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-7910. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday: 8:00am - 5:30pm Alt.Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

10/28/2008

/Dant B Shaifer - Harriman /
Examiner, Art Unit 2434

Application/Control Number: 10/798,580

Page 10

Art Unit: 2434

/Kambiz Zand/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2434